UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,159	07/14/2008	Egill Thor Ragnarsson	01190.0018	5610
	7590 12/21/201 ENDERSON, FARAB	EXAMINER		
LLP	ŕ	KUMAR, KALYANAVENKA K		
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3653	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/21/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application	No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/586,159		RAGNARSSON, EGILL THOR			
		Examiner		Art Unit			
		KALYANAV KUMAR	ENKATESHWARE	3653			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communicat or Reply	ion appears on the o	over sheet with the o	correspondence address			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL nations of time may be available under the provisions of 3 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutore to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, reply received by the Office later than three months aftered patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ING DATE OF THIS 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no even ation. ry period will apply and will by statute, cause the applic	S COMMUNICATION it, however, may a reply be tine expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ation to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status							
1) 🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed of	n <u>14 July 2006</u> .					
·							
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are valued. Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction	vithdrawn from cons					
Applicat	ion Papers						
10)	The specification is objected to by the E The drawing(s) filed on 14 July 2006 is/a Applicant may not request that any objectio Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to by	are: a) accepted on to the drawing(s) be on to correction is required	held in abeyance. Se	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). Djected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
,		the Examiner. Not	file attached Office	ACTION OF IOTHER TO-132.			
-	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority doc 2. Certified copies of the priority doc 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International See the attached detailed Office action for	cuments have been cuments have been he priority documen Bureau (PCT Rule	received. received in Applicat ts have been receiv 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage			
Attachmen	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4	I) 🔲 Interview Summary	y (PTO-413)			
2) Notice (3) Information	te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO- mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date		Paper No(s)/Mail D Notice of Informal F Other:	Pate			

Application/Control Number: 10/586,159 Page 2

Art Unit: 3653

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claim 1-9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 3. Regarding claim 1, the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention.

 See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claim 1-9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sjoberg** (USP 4,723,660) in view of **Magnusson et al (USP 6,321,914 B1)**.
- 6. Regarding claim 1 and 3-5, Sjoberg discloses a grading apparatus for grading objects such as fish or shrimp in respect of their size, comprising a plurality of juxtaposed endless conveyor belts (see Fig. 18), wherein the width separating adjacent

Application/Control Number: 10/586,159

Art Unit: 3653

conveyor belts is larger at the unloading end than at the loading end of the belts (see Fig. 18), each conveyor belt having a cross-section with sloping sides such that in between each adjacent pair of belts is formed a sorting channel with substantially continuous sloping sides (see Fig. 17), wherein each belt comprises a plurality of hinged segments forming said substantially continuous sloping sides, each of said hinged segments has an open cleft on the ridge between the sloping sides (see Fig. 16, near element 8), but Sjoberg does not explicitly disclose a sorting channel with substantially continuous sloping sides, each side being at an angle with respect to the axis of the belt in the range of about 70-85°. Magnusson teaches as obvious adjustability of the sloping angle 5-7° (col. 3, lines 22-35, the sloping angle of 5-7° would encompass the range of 85-83°). The claim would have been obvious because the technique for improving a particular class of devices was part of the ordinary capabilities of a person of ordinary skill in the art, in view of the teaching of the technique for improvement in other situations. In the present case, it would have been obvious to include adjustability in the ridge belt in order to grade different types of objections.

Page 3

- 7. Regarding claim 2, Sjoberg discloses each belt is a continuous elastic belt (see Fig. 4).
- 8. Regarding claim 6, Sjoberg discloses said cleft has a width In the range of about 3-10 mm (see Fig. 16 and 18 and col. 4, lines 54+ where the width is adjustable with respect to the continued length of the conveyor and is adjusted to the needed width to grade different sized articles).

Application/Control Number: 10/586,159

Art Unit: 3653

9. Regarding claim 7, Sjoberg/Magnusson discloses guiding means arranged by the loading end of the conveyor belts for guiding objects to be graded to the channels in between adjacent belts and away from ridges and/or clefts on top of said hinged segments (see Fig. 2).

Page 4

- 10. Regarding claim 8, Sjoberg discloses the use of an apparatus of any of claims 1-7 for the size grading of Items (col. 1, lines 13-25). Further, Applicant is respectfully reminded that claim language consisting of functional language and/or intended use phrasing is given little, if any, patentable weight as the apparatus must merely be capable of functioning, or being used, as claimed. See MPEP 2112.02, 2114. Here, the apparatus is capable of size grading items.
- 11. Regarding claim 9, Sjoberg discloses the items are selected from the group consisting of peeled or unpeeled shrimp tails, lobster tails, fish including capelin, sardine, herring, mackerel, horse mackerel, menhaden, anchovy, blue whiting, ocean perch, cod, pollock, haddock, oysters, clams and mussels (col. 1, lines 13-25). Further, Applicant is respectfully reminded that claim language consisting of functional language and/or intended use phrasing is given little, if any, patentable weight as the apparatus must merely be capable of functioning, or being used, as claimed. See MPEP 2112.02, 2114. Here, the apparatus is capable of grade fish products.

Application/Control Number: 10/586,159 Page 5

Art Unit: 3653

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kalyan Kumar whose telephone number is 571-272-

8102. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:00AM-3:30PM.

13. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stefanos Karmis can be reached on 571-272-6744. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

14. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kalyan Kumar Examiner Art Unit 3653

/Stefano Karmis/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3653